

1           AMY W. SCHULMAN  
2           DLA PIPER LLP  
3           1251 Avenue of the Americas  
4           New York, NY 10020  
3           Telephone: (212) 335-4500  
4           Facsimile: (212) 335-4501  
4           amy.schulman@dlapiper.com

5 STUART M. GORDON (SBN: 037477)  
6 GORDON & REES LLP  
7 Embarcadero Center West  
8 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
10 Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
11 Facsimile: (415) 986-8054  
12 sgordon@gordonrees.com

0 MICHAEL C. ZELLERS (SBN: 146904)  
1 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
2 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
4 Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
5 Facsimile: (213) 430-3409  
6 michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com

Attorneys for Defendants  
PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION, AND  
G.D. SEARLE LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

1 NOW COME Defendants Pfizer Inc. (improperly captioned in Plaintiff's Complaint as  
2 "Pfizer, Inc.") ("Pfizer"), Pharmacia Corporation ("Pharmacia"), and G.D. Searle LLC  
3 ("Searle") (collectively "Defendants"), and file this Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint  
4 ("Complaint"), and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I.

## **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

7 The Complaint does not state in sufficient detail when Plaintiff was prescribed or used  
8 Bextra® (valdecoxib) (“Bextra®”). Accordingly, this Answer can only be drafted generally.  
9 Defendants may seek leave to amend this Answer when discovery reveals the specific time  
10 periods in which Plaintiff was prescribed and used Bextra®.

II.

## ANSWER

## **Response to Allegations Regarding Parties**

14 1. Defendants admit that Plaintiff brought this civil action seeking monetary damages, but  
15 deny that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief or damages. Defendants admit that, during certain  
16 periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States  
17 to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
18 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of  
19 time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed,  
20 co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare  
21 providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the  
22 FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
23 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
24 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
25 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
26 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
27 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.  
28 2. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

28 | 2. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

1 truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff's age and citizenship, and, therefore, deny the same.  
 2 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 3. Defendants admit that Pfizer is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
 4 business in New York. Defendants admit that Pharmacia acquired Searle in 2000 and that, as  
 5 the result of a merger in April 2003, Searle and Pharmacia became subsidiaries of Pfizer.  
 6 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer marketed and co-promoted  
 7 Bextra® in the United States, including Puerto Rico, to be prescribed by healthcare providers  
 8 who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA.  
 9 Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and  
 10 ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
 11 such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
 12 this paragraph of the Complaint.

13 4. Defendants admit that Searle is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal  
 14 place of business in Illinois. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra®  
 15 was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted  
 16 and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
 17 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
 18 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

19 5. Defendants admit that Pharmacia is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
 20 business in New Jersey. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pharmacia  
 21 marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States, including Puerto Rico, to be  
 22 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
 23 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding  
 24 "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or  
 25 information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same.  
 26 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this Paragraph of the Complaint.

27 **Response to Allegations Regarding Jurisdiction and Venue**

28 6. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the

1 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the amount in controversy, and,  
2 therefore, deny that the same. However, Defendants admit that Plaintiff claims that the amount  
3 in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

4 7. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
5 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiff's citizenship and  
6 the amount in controversy, and, therefore, deny the same. However, Defendants admit that  
7 Plaintiff claims that the parties are diverse and that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000,  
8 exclusive of interests and costs.

9 8. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
10 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the judicial district in  
11 which the asserted claims allegedly arose, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny  
12 committing a tort in the State of Florida or the State of California and deny the remaining  
13 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 9. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
15 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States, including Puerto Rico, to be prescribed by  
16 healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their  
17 approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was  
18 manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and  
19 distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by  
20 law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
21 admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®.  
22 Defendants admit that they do business in the State of Puerto Rico. Defendants state that  
23 Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous.  
24 Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of such  
25 allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
26 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27 **Response to Allegations Regarding Interdistrict Assignment**

28 10. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants  
2 admit that this case should be transferred to In re: Bextra and Celebrex Marketing, Sales Prac.  
3 and Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL-1699, assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer by the Judicial  
4 Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on September 6, 2005.

5 **Response to Factual Allegations**

6 11. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
7 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
8 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 12. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
10 truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff's medical condition and whether Plaintiff used  
11 Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
12 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13 13. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
14 truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff's medical condition and whether Plaintiff used  
15 Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that  
16 Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph  
17 of the Complaint.

18 14. Defendants admit that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial  
19 change from the time of sale. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to  
20 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and,  
21 therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations this paragraph of the  
22 Complaint.

23 15. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
28 the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny remaining the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 16. Plaintiff's Complaint omits Paragraph Number 16.

3 17. Defendants admit that Bextra® is in a class of drugs that is, at times, referred to as non-  
4 steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs ("NSAIDS"). Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe  
5 and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information.  
6 Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its  
7 FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
8 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
9 paragraph of the Complaint.

10 18. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants  
11 and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
12 Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this  
13 paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to  
14 form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

15 19. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants  
16 and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
17 Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to  
19 form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

20 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 19 of the Complaint,  
21 Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward  
22 Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed  
23 required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in  
24 this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or  
25 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

26 20. Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the  
27 Complaint. Defendants lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 21. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are  
2 vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to  
3 the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful  
4 conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 22. Plaintiff does not allege having used Celebrex® in this Complaint. Nevertheless,  
6 Defendants admit that Celebrex® was launched in the United States in February 1999.  
7 Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
8 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time,  
9 Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be  
10 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
11 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time,  
12 Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-  
13 promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare  
14 providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the  
15 FDA. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx® are not  
16 directed toward Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is  
17 deemed required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the  
18 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx®. Defendants  
19 therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such  
20 allegations and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
21 paragraph of the Complaint.

22 23. Defendants admit that the New Drug Application for Bextra® was filed with the FDA  
23 on January 15, 2001. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the  
24 FDA, that Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis  
25 and adult rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea.  
26 Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and  
27 ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
28 such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 24. Defendants admit that Bextra® was approved by the FDA on November 16, 2001.  
3 Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is  
4 indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid  
5 arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining  
6 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 25. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
8 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
9 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny  
10 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 26. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
12 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
13 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
14 that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved  
15 prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are  
16 adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was  
17 adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the  
18 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

19 27. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
20 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
21 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
22 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
23 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-  
24 promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law  
25 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit  
26 that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which  
27 developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be  
28 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding  
2 "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or  
3 information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same.  
4 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
5 the Complaint.

6 28. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
7 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
8 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
9 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
10 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-  
11 promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law  
12 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit  
13 that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which  
14 developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be  
15 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
16 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
17 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 29. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
19 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
20 denied. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
21 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
22 this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 30. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants  
24 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
25 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
26 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
27 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 31. Defendants admit that the New Drug Application for Bextra® was filed with the FDA

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 on January 15, 2001. Defendants admit that Bextra® was approved by the FDA, on November  
2 16, 2001. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and the remaining allegations in this  
3 paragraph of the Complaint.

4 32. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
6 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
7 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
8 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 33. Defendants state that the referenced FDA Talk Paper for Bextra® speaks for itself and  
10 respectfully refer the Court to the Talk Paper for its actual language and text. Any attempt to  
11 characterize the Talk Paper is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
12 paragraph of the Complaint.

13 34. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
14 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
15 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 35. Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations concerning the “post-drug  
17 approval meta-analysis study” in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants are without  
18 sufficient information to confirm or deny such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.  
19 Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to  
20 the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is denied.  
21 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 36. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants  
23 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
24 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
25 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
26 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27 37. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 38. Defendants state that the referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself  
3 and respectfully refer the Court to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language  
4 and text. Any attempt to characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied.  
5 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 39. Defendants state that the referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself  
7 and respectfully refer the Court to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language  
8 and text. Any attempt to characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied.  
9 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 40. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
11 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
12 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13 41. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
15 this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 42. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
17 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
18 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

19 43. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
20 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
21 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 44. Defendants state that the referenced articles speak for themselves and respectfully refer  
23 the Court to the articles for their actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the  
24 articles is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the  
25 Complaint.

26 45. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
27 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
28 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 46. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
2 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the allegations in this  
3 paragraph of the Complaint.

4 47. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
5 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
6 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
7 paragraph of the Complaint.

8 48. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants  
9 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
10 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
11 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
12 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13 49. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
15 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
17 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 50. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
23 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 51. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
26 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
27 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
28 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 the Complaint.

2 52. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
3 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
4 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
5 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
6 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
7 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
8 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
9 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
10 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
11 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
12 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants are without knowledge or information  
13 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used  
14 Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
15 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 53. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx® are not directed  
17 toward Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed  
18 required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in  
19 this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx®. Defendants therefore lack sufficient  
20 information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore,  
21 deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in  
22 this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 54. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
24 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
25 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
26 paragraph of the Complaint.

27 55. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
28 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
2 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
3 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
4 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
5 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
6 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
7 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
8 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
9 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
10 paragraph of the Complaint.

11 56. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
12 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
13 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
14 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
15 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is unreasonably dangerous, and  
16 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17 57. Defendants admit that the FDA Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and  
18 Communications (“DDMAC”) sent a letter to Pfizer dated January 10, 2005. Defendants state  
19 that the referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its  
20 actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants admit  
21 that the DDMAC sent a letter to Searle dated October 6, 1999. Defendants state that the  
22 referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its actual  
23 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants state that the  
24 transcripts of the FDA Arthritis Drugs Advisory Committee hearings speak for themselves and  
25 respectfully refer the Court to the transcripts for their actual language and text. Any attempt to  
26 characterize the transcripts is denied. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for  
27 itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt  
28 to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 paragraph of the Complaint.

2 58. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
3 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
4 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
5 that the referenced press release speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the press  
6 release for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the press release is denied.  
7 Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to  
8 the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied.  
9 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
10 the Complaint.

11 59. Defendants state that the referenced press release speaks for itself and respectfully refer  
12 the Court to the press release for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the  
13 press release is denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining  
14 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 60. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
16 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
17 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
18 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
19 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
20 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
21 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
22 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
23 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
24 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
25 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert  
26 approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms  
27 of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary  
28 dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 61. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
2 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
3 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
4 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
5 Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and  
6 ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
7 such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
8 that Bextra® is defective, and deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 62. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
10 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
11 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
12 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
13 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
14 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
15 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
16 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
17 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
18 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
19 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
20 paragraph of the Complaint.

21 63. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
22 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
23 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
24 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
25 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 64. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
27 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
28 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
2 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
3 the Complaint.

4 65. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
6 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
7 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
8 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
9 the Complaint.

10 66. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 67. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
12 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
13 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
14 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
15 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
16 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
17 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
18 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
19 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
20 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
21 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
22 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 68. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
24 truth of the allegations regarding and whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the  
25 same. Defendants state that the referenced press releases speak for themselves and respectfully  
26 refer the Court to the press releases for their actual language and text. Any attempt to  
27 characterize the press releases is denied. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
28 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
2 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
3 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
4 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 69. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
6 truth of the allegations regarding and whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the  
7 same. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
9 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
11 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
12 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13 70. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
15 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
17 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
18 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

19 71. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
20 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
21 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
22 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
23 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
24 the Complaint.

25 72. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
26 paragraph of the Complaint.

27 73. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
2 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
3 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-  
4 promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law  
5 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit  
6 that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which  
7 developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be  
8 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
9 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
10 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 74. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
12 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
13 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
14 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
15 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
16 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
17 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 **Response to First Cause of Action: Negligence**

20 75. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
21 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

22 76. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
23 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
24 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
25 duties. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described  
26 in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported  
27 with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
28 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants

1 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 77. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
3 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
4 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
5 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
6 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
7 this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 78. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
9 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants  
10 admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such duties.  
11 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
12 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
13 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
14 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
15 any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint,  
16 including all subparts.

17 79. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
19 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
20 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
21 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
22 the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
23 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
24 the Complaint.

25 80. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
27 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
28 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
2 the Complaint.

3 81. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
4 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
5 that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
6 paragraph of the Complaint.

7 82. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
9 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
11 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
12 the Complaint.

13 83. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
14 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 84. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
16 damage and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph Number 84 of the  
18 Complaint, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
19 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 **Response to Second Cause of Action: Strict Liability**

21 85. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
22 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

23 86. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
24 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
25 Defendants admit that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial change in  
26 the condition from the time of sale. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time,  
27 Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed  
28 by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their

1 approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was  
2 manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and  
3 distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by  
4 law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
5 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 87. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
7 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
8 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
9 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
10 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 88. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
12 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
13 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
14 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
15 Defendants deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining  
16 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17 89. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
19 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
20 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
21 Defendants deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining  
22 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 90. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
24 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants  
25 are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
26 allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants  
27 state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-  
28 approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all  
2 times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny that  
3 Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
4 paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

5 91. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
6 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
7 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
8 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
9 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
10 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
11 that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
12 paragraph of the Complaint.

13 92. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
14 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
15 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
16 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
17 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
18 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
19 that Bextra® is defective and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 93. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
21 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
22 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 94. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, deny that Bextra®  
28 caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Complaint.

2 95. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
3 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
4 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
5 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
6 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
7 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 96. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
9 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
10 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
11 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
12 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
13 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
14 that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra®  
15 in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to  
16 prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during  
17 certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed,  
18 tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by  
19 healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their  
20 approval by the FDA. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective,  
21 deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
22 paragraph of the Complaint.

23 97. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 98. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
2 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
3 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
4 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
5 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
6 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
7 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 99. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
9 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
10 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
11 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
12 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
13 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
14 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 100. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
16 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and  
17 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 101. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23 the Complaint.

24 102. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
25 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 103. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
27 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph Number 103 of the

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Complaint, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
2 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 **Response to Third Cause of Action: Breach of Express Warranty**

4 104. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
5 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

6 105. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
7 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
8 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
9 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
10 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
11 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
12 that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®. Defendants  
13 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 106. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
15 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
16 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
17 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
18 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
19 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
20 that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®. Defendants  
21 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

22 107. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 108. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
28 Bextra®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

1 109. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
 2 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
 3 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
 4 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
 5 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
 6 Bextra®. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
 7 the Complaint.

8 110. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
 9 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
 10 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
 11 Bextra®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 111. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
 13 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
 14 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
 15 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
 16 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
 17 the Complaint.

18 112. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 19 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 113. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 21 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph Number 113 of the  
 23 Complaint, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
 24 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 **Response to Fourth Cause of Action: Breach of Implied Warranty**

26 114. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
 27 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

28 115. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed

1 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
2 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
3 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
4 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
5 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
6 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
7 paragraph of the Complaint.

8 116. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
9 Bextra®. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that  
10 Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
11 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
12 that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved  
13 prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the  
14 Complaint.

15 117. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
16 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
17 Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is  
18 indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid  
19 arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining  
20 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 118. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
22 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
23 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
24 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
25 paragraph of the Complaint.

26 119. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
27 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
28 Defendants state that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial change in

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 the condition from the time of sale. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
 2 paragraph of the Complaint.

3 120. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
 4 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
 5 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
 6 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
 7 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 121. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
 9 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
 10 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
 11 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
 12 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
 13 the Complaint.

14 122. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 15 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 123. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 17 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph Number 123 of the  
 19 Complaint, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
 20 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 **Response to Fifth Cause of Action: Fraudulent Misrepresentation & Concealment**

22 124. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
 23 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

24 125. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
 25 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
 26 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
 27 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
 28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of

1 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
2 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
3 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 126. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
6 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
7 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
8 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
9 the Complaint, including all subparts.

10 127. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
11 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
12 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
13 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
14 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
15 the Complaint.

16 128. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
17 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
18 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
19 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
20 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably  
21 dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 129. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
23 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
24 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
25 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
26 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
27 the Complaint.

28 130. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 paragraph of the Complaint.

2 131. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
3 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
4 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
5 the Complaint.

6 132. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
7 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
8 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
9 the Complaint.

10 133. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
11 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
12 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
13 the Complaint.

14 134. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
15 paragraph of the Complaint.

16 135. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
17 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
18 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
19 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
20 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
21 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
22 any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 136. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
28 the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 137. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
2 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 138. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
4 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph Number 138 of the  
6 Complaint, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury  
7 or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 **Response to Sixth Cause of Action: Unjust Enrichment**

9 139. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
10 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

11 140. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
12 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
13 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
14 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
15 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
16 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
17 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 141. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
20 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
21 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 142. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
23 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
24 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 143. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
26 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
27 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
28 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 paragraph of the Complaint.

2 144. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
 3 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
 4 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 Answering the unnumbered paragraph of the Complaint following Paragraph Number  
 6 144, Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 7 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 **Response to Prayer for Relief**

9 Answering the unnumbered paragraph of the Complaint headed "Prayer for Relief,"  
 10 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
 11 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

12 **III.**

13 **GENERAL DENIAL**

14 Defendants deny all allegations and/or legal conclusions set forth in Plaintiff's  
 15 Complaint that have not been previously admitted, denied, or explained.

16 **IV.**

17 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

18 Defendants reserve the right to rely upon any of the following or additional defenses to  
 19 claims asserted by Plaintiff to the extent that such defenses are supported by information  
 20 developed through discovery or evidence at trial. Defendants affirmatively show that:

21 **First Defense**

22 1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

23 **Second Defense**

24 2. Bextra® is a prescription medical product. The federal government has preempted the  
 25 field of law applicable to the labeling and warning of prescription medical products.  
 26 Defendants' labeling and warning of Bextra® was at all times in compliance with applicable  
 27 federal law. Plaintiff's causes of action against Defendants, therefore, fail to state a claim upon

1 which relief can be granted; such claims, if allowed, would conflict with applicable federal law  
2 and violate the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.

## **Third Defense**

4 3. At all relevant times, Defendants provided proper warnings, information, and  
5 instructions for the drug in accordance with generally recognized and prevailing standards in  
6 existence at the time.

## **Fourth Defense**

8       4. At all relevant times, Defendants' warnings and instructions with respect to the use of  
9       Bextra® conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of  
10      knowledge at the time the drug was manufactured, marketed, and distributed.

## **Fifth Defense**

2 5. Plaintiff's action is time-barred as it is filed outside of the time permitted by the  
3 applicable Statute of Limitations, and same is pled in full bar of any liability as to Defendants.

## Sixth Defense

5 | 6. Plaintiff's action is barred by the statute of repose.

## **Seventh Defense**

17 7. Plaintiff's claims against Defendants are barred to the extent Plaintiff was contributorily  
18 negligent, actively negligent or otherwise failed to mitigate Plaintiff's damages, and any  
19 recovery by Plaintiff should be diminished accordingly.

## Eighth Defense

21 8. The proximate cause of the loss complained of by Plaintiff is not due to any acts or  
22 omissions on the part of Defendants. Rather, said loss is due to the acts or omissions on the  
23 part of third parties unrelated to Defendants and for whose acts or omissions Defendants are not  
24 liable in any way.

## **Ninth Defense**

26 9. The acts and/or omissions of unrelated third parties as alleged constituted independent,  
27 intervening causes for which Defendants cannot be liable.

**Tenth Defense**

10. Any injuries or expenses incurred by Plaintiff were not caused by Bextra®, but were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by an idiosyncratic reaction, operation of nature, or act of God.

## **Eleventh Defense**

11. Defendants affirmatively deny that they violated any duty owed to Plaintiff.

## Twelfth Defense

12. A manufacturer has no duty to warn patients or the general public of any risk, contraindication, or adverse effect associated with the use of a prescription medical product. Rather, the law requires that all such warnings and appropriate information be given to the prescribing physician and the medical profession, which act as a "learned intermediary" in determining the use of the product. Bextra® is a prescription medical product, available only on the order of a licensed physician. Bextra® provided an adequate warning to Plaintiff's treating and prescribing physicians.

### **Thirteenth Defense**

13. The product at issue was not in a defective condition or unreasonably dangerous at the time it left the control of the manufacturer or seller.

## **Fourteenth Defense**

14. Bextra® was at all times material to the Complaint reasonably safe and reasonably fit for its intended use and the warnings and instructions accompanying Bextra® at the time of the occurrence of the injuries alleged by Plaintiff were legally adequate for its approved usages.

## **Fifteenth Defense**

15. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred in whole or in part by the lack of a defect as the Bextra® allegedly ingested by Plaintiff was prepared in accordance with the applicable standard of care.

## **Sixteenth Defense**

16. Plaintiff's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of misuse or abnormal use of the product Bextra® after the product left the control of Defendants and any liability of

1 Defendants is therefore barred.

2 **Seventeenth Defense**

3 17. Plaintiff's alleged damages were not caused by any failure to warn on the part of  
4 Defendants.

5 **Eighteenth Defense**

6 18. Plaintiff's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of preexisting or subsequent  
7 conditions unrelated to Bextra®.

8 **Nineteenth Defense**

9 19. Plaintiff knew or should have known of any risk associated with Bextra®; therefore, the  
10 doctrine of assumption of the risk bars or diminishes any recovery.

11 **Twentieth Defense**

12 20. Plaintiff is barred from recovering against Defendants because Plaintiff's claims are  
13 preempted in accordance with the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution and by  
14 the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, 21 U.S.C. § 301 et. seq.

15 **Twenty-first Defense**

16 21. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part under the applicable state law because  
17 the subject pharmaceutical product at issue was subject to and received pre-market approval by  
18 the Food and Drug Administration under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

19 **Twenty-second Defense**

20 22. The manufacture, distribution, and sale of the pharmaceutical product referred to in  
21 Plaintiff's Complaint were at all times in compliance with all federal regulations and statutes,  
22 and Plaintiff's causes of action are preempted.

23 **Twenty-third Defense**

24 23. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by the deference given to the primary  
25 jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration over the subject pharmaceutical product at  
26 issue under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

**Gordon & Rees, LLP**  
**275 Battery Street, Suite 2000**  
**San Francisco CA 94111**

## Twenty-fourth Defense

24. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because there is no private right of action concerning matters regulated by the Food and Drug Administration under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

## **Twenty-fifth Defense**

25. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendants provided adequate "direction or warnings" as to the use of the subject pharmaceutical product within the meaning of Comment j to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

## Twenty-sixth Defense

26. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited to a product liability failure to warn claim because Bextra® is a prescription pharmaceutical drug and falls within the ambit of Restatement (Second) of Torts § 402A, Comment k.

## Twenty-seventh Defense

27. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue "provides net benefits for a class of patients" within the meaning of Comment f to § 6 of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

## Twenty-eighth Defense

28. Plaintiff's claims are barred under § 4, et seq., of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

## Twenty-ninth Defense

29. To the extent that Plaintiff is seeking punitive damages, Plaintiff has failed to plead facts sufficient under the law to justify an award of punitive damages.

## Thirtieth Defense

30. Defendants affirmatively aver that the imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate Defendants' rights to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Constitutions of the States of Florida and California, and would additionally violate Defendants' rights to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

## **Thirty-first Defense**

31. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

## **Thirty-second Defense**

32. The imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

### **Thirty-third Defense**

33. Plaintiff's punitive damage claims are preempted by federal law.

## **Thirty-fourth Defense**

34. In the event that reliance was placed upon Defendants' nonconformance to an express representation, this action is barred as there was no reliance upon representations, if any, of Defendants.

## **Thirty-fifth Defense**

35. Plaintiff failed to provide Defendants with timely notice of any alleged nonconformance to any express representation.

## **Thirty-sixth Defense**

36. To the extent that Plaintiff's claims are based on a theory providing for liability without proof of causation, the claims violate Defendants' rights under the United States Constitution.

## **Thirty-seventh Defense**

37. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the advertisements, if any, and labeling with respect to the subject pharmaceutical products were not false or misleading and, therefore, constitute protected commercial speech under the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution.

## Thirty-eighth Defense

38. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks punitive damages for the conduct which allegedly caused injuries asserted in the Complaint, punitive damages are barred or reduced by applicable law or statute or, in the alternative, are unconstitutional insofar as they violate the due process protections afforded by the United States Constitution, the excessive fines clause of the Eighth

1 Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Commerce Clause of the United States  
 2 Constitution, and the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution, and  
 3 applicable provisions of the Constitutions of the States of Florida and California. Any law,  
 4 statute, or other authority purporting to permit the recovery of punitive damages in this case is  
 5 unconstitutional, facially and as applied, to the extent that, without limitation, it: (1) lacks  
 6 constitutionally sufficient standards to guide and restrain the jury's discretion in determining  
 7 whether to award punitive damages and/or the amount, if any; (2) is void for vagueness in that  
 8 it failed to provide adequate advance notice as to what conduct will result in punitive damages;  
 9 (3) permits recovery of punitive damages based on out-of-state conduct, conduct that complied  
 10 with applicable law, or conduct that was not directed, or did not proximately cause harm, to  
 11 Plaintiff; (4) permits recovery of punitive damages in an amount that is not both reasonable and  
 12 proportionate to the amount of harm, if any, to Plaintiff and to the amount of compensatory  
 13 damages, if any; (5) permits jury consideration of net worth or other financial information  
 14 relating to Defendants; (6) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to be applied by the trial  
 15 court in post-verdict review of any punitive damages awards; (7) lacks constitutionally  
 16 sufficient standards for appellate review of punitive damages awards; and (8) otherwise fails to  
 17 satisfy Supreme Court precedent, including, without limitation, *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v.*  
 18 *Haslip*, 499 U.S. 1, 111 (1991), *TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources, Inc.*, 509 U.S.  
 19 443 (1993); *BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore*, 519 U.S. 559 (1996); and *State Farm Mut.*  
 20 *Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 538 U.S. 408 (2003).

21 **Thirty-ninth Defense**

22 39. The methods, standards, and techniques utilized with respect to the manufacture, design,  
 23 and marketing of Bextra®, if any, used in this case, included adequate warnings and  
 24 instructions with respect to the product's use in the package insert and other literature, and  
 25 conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of the  
 26 knowledge at the time the product was marketed.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

## Fortieth Defense

40. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because Bextra® was designed, tested, manufactured, and labeled in accordance with the state-of-the-art industry standards existing at the time of the sale.

## Forty-first Defense

41. If Plaintiff has sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and belief, such injuries and losses were caused by the actions of persons not having real or apparent authority to take said actions on behalf of Defendants and over whom Defendants had no control and for whom Defendants may not be held accountable.

## **Forty-second Defense**

42. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra® was not unreasonably dangerous or defective, was suitable for the purpose for which it was intended, and was distributed with adequate and sufficient warnings.

## **Forty-third Defense**

43. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, and/or estoppel.

## Forty-fourth Defense

44. Plaintiff's claims are barred because Plaintiff's injuries, if any, were the result of the pre-existing and/or unrelated medical, genetic, and/or environmental conditions, diseases or illnesses, subsequent medical conditions or natural courses of conditions of Plaintiff, and were independent of or far removed from Defendants' conduct.

## Forty-fifth Defense

45. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra® did not proximately cause injuries or damages to Plaintiff.

## **Forty-sixth Defense**

46. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Plaintiff did not incur any ascertainable loss as a result of Defendants' conduct.

## **Forty-seventh Defense**

47. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because the manufacturing, labeling, packaging, and any advertising of the product complied with the applicable codes, standards and regulations established, adopted, promulgated or approved by any applicable regulatory body, including but not limited to the United States, any state, and any agency thereof.

## Forty-eighth Defense

48. The claims must be dismissed because Plaintiff would have taken Bextra® even if the product labeling contained the information that Plaintiff contends should have been provided.

## **Forty-ninth Defense**

49. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because the utility of Bextra® outweighed its risks.

## **Fiftieth Defense**

50. Plaintiff's damages, if any, are barred or limited by the payments received from collateral sources.

## **Fifty-first Defense**

51. Defendants' liability, if any, can only be determined after the percentages of responsibility of all persons who caused or contributed toward Plaintiff's alleged damages, if any, are determined. Defendants seek an adjudication of the percentage of fault of the claimants and each and every other person whose fault could have contributed to the alleged injuries and damages, if any, of Plaintiff.

## **Fifty-second Defense**

52. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of abstention in that the common law gives deference to discretionary actions by the United States Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

## **Fifty-third Defense**

53. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra® is comprehensively regulated by the FDA pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act

1 ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. §§ 301 *et seq.*, and regulations promulgated there under, and Plaintiff's  
 2 claims conflict with the FDCA, with the regulations promulgated by FDA to implement the  
 3 FDCA, with the purposes and objectives of the FDCA and FDA's implementing regulations,  
 4 and with the specific determinations by FDA specifying the language that should be used in the  
 5 labeling accompanying Bextra®. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims are preempted by the  
 6 Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, Article VI, clause 2, and the laws of the  
 7 United States.

8 **Fifty-fourth Defense**

9 54. Plaintiff's misrepresentation allegations are not stated with the degree of particularity  
 10 required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) and should be dismissed.

11 **Fifty-fifth Defense**

12 55. Defendants state on information and belief that the Complaint and each purported cause  
 13 of action contained therein is barred by the statutes of limitations contained in California Code  
 14 of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1 and 338 and former § 340(3), and such other statutes of limitation  
 15 as may apply.

16 **Fifty-sixth Defense**

17 56. Defendants state on information and belief that any injuries, losses, or damages suffered  
 18 by Plaintiff were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence or other actionable  
 19 conduct of persons or entities other than Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiff's recovery against  
 20 Defendants, if any, should be reduced pursuant to California Civil Code § 1431.2.

21 **Fifty-seventh Defense**

22 57. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of  
 23 Defendants, no act or omission was oppressive, fraudulent, or malicious under California Civil  
 24 Code § 3294, and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred. Any claim for punitive  
 25 damages is also barred under California Civil Code § 3294(b).

26 **Fifty-eighth Defense**

27 58. Plaintiff's fraud-based claims, if any, are not stated with particularity as required by  
 28 Rule 1.120 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

## **Fifty-ninth Defense**

59. Plaintiff's claims are barred because Bextra® was designed, manufactured, and marketed in accordance with the state of the art at the time of manufacture per § 768.1257, Florida Statutes.

## Sixtieth Defense

60. Bextra® is not defective or unreasonably dangerous, and Defendants are not liable because, at the time of sale or distribution of the Bextra® alleged to have been used by Plaintiff, Defendants had complied with applicable regulations of the federal Food & Drug Administration and are entitled to application of § 768.1256, Florida Statutes.

## Sixty-first Defense

61. Plaintiff's injuries and damages, if any, were proximately caused by the negligence or fault of Plaintiff, or persons or parties whose identities are unknown at this time, and such comparative negligence or fault is sufficient to proportionately reduce or bar Plaintiff's recovery. Thus, Defendants are entitled to have their liability to the Plaintiff, if any, reduced as a result of the negligence or fault of said persons or entities, pursuant to the provisions of § 768.81, Florida Statutes. To the extent any recovery is permitted in this case, pursuant to §§ 768.31 and 768.81, Florida Statutes, judgment must be entered on the basis of Defendants' percentage of fault, taking into account the percentage of fault attributable to all other persons, whether or not a party hereto, and not on the basis of joint and several liability. The persons or entities referred to in this paragraph that are presently unknown to Defendants will be identified in a timely manner consistent with *Nash v. Wells Fargo*, 678 So. 2d 1262 (Fla. 1996).

## Sixty-second Defense

62. Plaintiff fails to state a claim for violation of The Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act (“FDUTPA”).

### **Sixty-third Defense**

63. FDUTPA does not apply to claims for personal injuries, and, accordingly, Plaintiff's FDUTPA claim is improper and should be dismissed.

## Sixty-fourth Defense

2 64. The acts or practices of which Plaintiff complains were and are required or specifically  
3 permitted by federal or state law. Therefore, Plaintiff's FDUTPA claim is barred, fails to state  
4 a claim, and should be dismissed with prejudice.

## **Sixty-fifth Defense**

6 65. Plaintiff lacks standing because Defendants did not engage in deceptive conduct with  
7 regard to Plaintiff or otherwise.

## **Sixty-sixth Defense**

9 66. Defendants reserve the right to supplement their assertion of defenses as they continue  
10 with their factual investigation of Plaintiff's claims.

V.

## **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

14 1. That Plaintiff take nothing from Defendants by reason of the Complaint;

15 2. That the Complaint be dismissed;

16 3. That Defendants be awarded their costs for this lawsuit;

17 4. That the trier of fact determine what percentage of the combined fault or other liability

18 of all persons whose fault or other liability proximately caused Plaintiff's alleged injuries,

19 losses or damages is attributable to each person;

20 5. That any judgment for damages against Defendants in favor of Plaintiff be no greater

21 than an amount which equals their proportionate share, if any, of the total fault or other liability

22 which proximately caused Plaintiff's injuries and damages; and

23 6. That Defendants have such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

1                   October 5, 2007

GORDON & REES LLP

2                   By: \_\_\_\_\_ /c/

3                   Stuart M. Gordon  
4                   sgordon@gordonrees.com  
5                   Embarcadero Center West  
6                   275 Battery Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
7                   San Francisco, CA 94111  
8                   Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
9                   Fax: (415) 986-8054

10                  October 5, 2007

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

11                  By: \_\_\_\_\_ /c/

12                  Michael C. Zellers  
13                  michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com  
14                  515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
15                  Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
16                  Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
17                  Fax: (213) 430-3409

18                  Attorneys for Defendants  
19                  PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA  
20                  CORPORATION, AND G.D. SEARLE  
21                  LLC

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 **JURY DEMAND**

2 Defendants Pfizer Inc., Pharmacia Corporation, and G.D. Searle LLC, hereby demand a  
3 trial by jury of all the facts and issues in this case pursuant to 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
4 Procedure.

5 October 5, 2007

GORDON & REES LLP

7 By: \_\_\_\_\_/c/\_\_\_\_\_

8 Stuart M. Gordon  
9 sgordon@gordonrees.com  
10 Embarcadero Center West  
11 275 Battery Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
12 San Francisco, CA 94111  
13 Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
14 Fax: (415) 986-8054

15 October 5, 2007

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

16 By: \_\_\_\_\_/c/\_\_\_\_\_

17 Michael C. Zellers  
18 michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com  
19 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
20 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
21 Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
22 Fax: (213) 430-3409

23 Attorneys for Defendants  
24 PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA  
25 CORPORATION, AND G.D. SEARLE  
26 LLC

27 **Gordon & Rees, LLP**  
28 **275 Battery Street, Suite 2000**  
29 **San Francisco, CA 94111**